

**FRONTIER LAW CENTER**

Robert L. Starr (183052)  
[robert@frontierlawcenter.com](mailto:robert@frontierlawcenter.com)  
Adam M. Rose (210880)  
[adam@frontierlawcenter.com](mailto:adam@frontierlawcenter.com)  
Karo G. Karapetyan (318101)  
[karo@frontierlawcenter.com](mailto:karo@frontierlawcenter.com)  
23901 Calabasas Road, Suite 2074  
Calabasas, California 91302  
Telephone: (818) 914-3433  
Facsimile: (818) 914-3433

**POMERANTZ LLP**

Jordan L. Lurie (130013)  
[jlurie@pomlaw.com](mailto:jlurie@pomlaw.com)  
Ari Y. Basser (272618)  
[abasser@pomlaw.com](mailto:abasser@pomlaw.com)  
1100 Glendon Avenue, 15th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
Telephone: (310) 432-8492  
Facsimile: (310) 861-8591

**THE MARLBOROUGH LAW FIRM, P.C.**

Christopher Marlborough (298219)  
[chris@marlboroughlawfirm.com](mailto:chris@marlboroughlawfirm.com)  
445 Broad Hollow Road, Suite 400  
Melville, NY 11747  
Telephone: (212) 991-8960  
Facsimile: (212) 991-8952

Attorneys for Plaintiff Gor Gevorkyan

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Gor Gevorkyan, on behalf of himself and all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Bitmain, Inc., Bitmain Technologies, Ltd.,  
and DOES 1 to 10,

Defendants.

**O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP**

Carlos M. Lazatin (SBN 229650)  
[clazatin@omm.com](mailto:clazatin@omm.com)  
William K. Pao (SBN 252637)  
[wpao@omm.com](mailto:wpao@omm.com)  
Vincent Zhou (SBN 251969)  
[vzhou@omm.com](mailto:vzhou@omm.com)  
400 South Hope Street, 18th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 430-7576

Attorneys for Defendant Bitmain  
Technologies, Ltd.

Case Number: 3:18-cv-07004-JD

**CLASS ACTION**

[HON. JAMES DONATO]

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT  
CONFERENCE STATEMENT**

Date: December 19, 2019  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Ctrm: 11, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b), Local Civil Rule 16-9, and the Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California, Plaintiff Gor Gevorkyan (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Bitmain Technologies, Ltd. (“Defendant” or “Bitmain”) (and collectively the “Parties”) hereby respectfully submit the following Joint Case Management Conference Statement (“CMC Statement”) following telephonic meet and confers, which occurred on November 27 and December 2, 2019. To the extent the Parties do not agree on certain issues discussed herein, their positions on such issues are stated below.

## **I. JURISDICTION AND SERVICE**

The Court has subject matter over Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). Defendant has been served with the operative complaint and has filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. (Dkt. No. 33.) No parties remain to be served.

## **II. FACTS**

### **A. Plaintiff’s Summary of Facts and Issues in Dispute**

This prospective consumer class action arises out of Defendants’ sale of Application Specific Integrated Circuit Devices (ASIC Devices) used to mine cryptocurrency to customers in California. Defendants’ alleged practices include: (1) Defendants’ “secret mining” practices or the use of customers’ ASIC devices after purchase and before delivery by Defendants to customers, causing wear and tear on the devices and contributing to the increased difficulty of mining cryptocurrency by the time the ASIC devices are delivered to customers; and (2) Defendants’ use of the products after delivery to customers by preconfiguring the devices to mine cryptocurrency for the benefit of Defendants rather than customers who purchased the devices (collective, “the Alleged Practices”).

Disputed issues of fact include: (1) Whether and to what extent Defendants engaged in the Alleged Practices; (2) the nature and extent of Defendants’ contacts with California; and (3) the nature and extent of any damages.

1                   **B.       Defendant's Summary of Facts and Issues in Dispute**

2                   Plaintiff's Amended Complaint asserts four causes of action against Bitmain for: (1)  
3 violation of California's Unfair Competition Law; (2) conversion; (3) unjust enrichment; and (4)  
4 trespass to chattels. (Dkt. No. 32.) Bitmain maintains that none of these claims is viable, and  
5 specifically denies Plaintiff's underlying factual allegations. As a threshold matter, however,  
6 Bitmain, a company based in Beijing, China that has no employees and no operations in  
7 California, is not subject to this Court's personal jurisdiction. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 33, 38.) This issue  
8 is dispositive of all of Plaintiff's claims and warrants dismissal of the action in its entirety. (*Id.*)

9                   Accordingly, to avoid waiving its challenge to personal jurisdiction, *see Peterson v.*  
10 *Highland Music, Inc.*, 140 F.3d 1313, 1317–18 (9th Cir. 1998) (noting that a personal  
11 jurisdiction defense may be waived as a result of litigation conduct inconsistent with that  
12 defense), Bitmain proposes that the Parties file a further case management statement no later  
13 than twenty-one (21) days after the Court's ruling on Bitmain's pending motion to dismiss (if the  
14 case is not dismissed) that shall provide a more comprehensive summary of facts and issues in  
15 dispute.  
16

17                   **III.     LEGAL ISSUES**

18                   In the event the Court denies Defendant's pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal  
19 jurisdiction, legal issues presented by this action will include but are not limited to: (1) Whether  
20 Plaintiff is subject to mandatory pre-dispute arbitration; (2) Whether a class should be certified in  
21 the action for any of the claims asserted in the Amended Complaint; and (3) Whether Plaintiff can  
22 prevail on the claims asserted in his Amended Complaint: (a) violation of California's Unfair  
23 Competition Law; (b) Conversion; (c) Unjust Enrichment, and (d) Trespass to Chattel (Dkt. No.  
24 32).

25                   **IV.     MOTIONS**

26                   Defendant Bitmain Technologies Ltd. filed its motion to dismiss Plaintiff's Amended  
27 Complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction on October 1, 2019. (Dkt. No. 33.) The motion has  
28 been fully briefed and is scheduled for oral argument on December 19, 2019. In the event the

pending motion to dismiss is denied, Defendant anticipates filing a motion to compel arbitration, along with a motion for judgment on the pleadings for failure to state a claim and a motion to stay discovery pending resolution of those motions. Plaintiff will oppose any motion to compel arbitration or motion for judgment on the pleadings filed by Defendant.

In the event the pending motion to dismiss is denied in whole or in part, Plaintiff anticipates filing a Motion for Class Certification (“MFCC”), which Defendant will oppose. Each of the Parties anticipates filing motions for summary judgment following the close of discovery if warranted by the evidence.

**A. Plaintiff’s Proposed MFCC Deadlines**

Plaintiff proposes the following dates and deadlines in conjunction with the briefing on his anticipated MFCC:

EVENT	DEADLINE/DATE
Last day to file MFCC	12 months after the order on Defendant’s anticipated motion for judgment on the pleadings
Last day to file Opposition	45 days after filing of MFCC
Last day to file Reply	45 days after Opposition is due
Last day for Plaintiff to disclose experts in support of MFCC	At time Plaintiff’s MFCC is filed
Last day for Defendant to disclose experts in opposition to MFCC	At time Opposition to MFCC is filed

Plaintiff also proposes that experts offered in support of briefing on the MFCC shall be made available for deposition beginning no later than two (2) weeks after the filing of the MFCC and Opposition, respectively.

**B. Defendant’s Position on Proposed MFCC Deadlines**

As stated above, Defendant maintains that the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over it. (Dkt. Nos. 33, 38.) Accordingly, although Defendant agrees with some aspects of Plaintiff’s proposal, Defendant believes it would be premature to set a briefing schedule and deadlines related to a hypothetical motion for class certification. Defendant proposes that, if the Court

1 were to deny Defendant's pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, the Parties  
2 will submit a proposed briefing schedule for Plaintiff's anticipated motion for class certification  
3 no later than twenty-one (21) days after such ruling.

#### 4 **V. AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS**

5 The Parties do not anticipate amendments to the pleadings at this time but reserve their  
6 respective rights to seek leave to amend based on discovery in this action. The Parties agree to  
7 meet and confer to determine a deadline for amendment of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint  
8 in the event that the Court denies Defendant's pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal  
9 jurisdiction.

#### 10 **VI. EVIDENCE PRESERVATION**

11 The Parties have reviewed the Guidelines Relating to the Discovery of Electronically  
12 Stored Information ("ESI Guidelines") and confirm that on November 27 and December 2, 2019,  
13 the Parties met and conferred pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) regarding reasonable and  
14 proportionate steps to preserve evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action.  
15 The Parties agree to meet and confer on ESI issues as they arise, which may include entering into  
16 an ESI Protocol, if appropriate.

#### 17 **VII. DISCLOSURES**

##### 18 **A. Plaintiff's Proposal for Initial Disclosures**

19 Plaintiff proposes that the Parties exchange initial disclosures on or before January 2,  
20 2020, in accordance with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A).

##### 21 **B. Defendant's Proposal for Initial Disclosures**

22 Defendant's position is that the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over it (*see* Dkt. Nos.  
23 33, 38), and that exchanging initial disclosures could be construed as litigation conduct that  
24 waives Defendant's personal jurisdiction defense. *Peterson*, 140 F.3d at 1317–18. Although  
25 Plaintiff has agreed not to challenge Defendant's personal jurisdiction argument on this waiver  
26 ground, in an abundance of caution, Defendant proposes that the Parties exchange initial  
27  
28

1 disclosures no later than fourteen (14) days after the Court's ruling on Defendant's pending  
2 motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, if this action remains active at that time.

### 3 **VIII. DISCOVERY**

4 The Parties have not taken any discovery to date. The Parties anticipate that, because  
5 Bitmain is a foreign corporation based in China, it will require some modifications of the  
6 discovery rules, for example, to allow for longer lead times to notice depositions and longer  
7 periods to respond to written discovery. In the event the Court denies Defendant's pending  
8 motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, the scope of Plaintiff's anticipated discovery  
9 includes but is not limited to: Defendant's policies and practices with respect to the Alleged  
10 Practices. In the event the Court denies Defendant's pending motion to dismiss for lack of  
11 personal jurisdiction, the scope of Defendant's anticipated discovery includes but is not limited  
12 to: Plaintiff's and putative class members' purchases and use of the ASIC Devices; evidentiary  
13 bases for Plaintiff's claims that his and other ASIC devices were "used" when received, that his  
14 and other devices mined Bitcoin for Bitmain during the set up process, and Plaintiff's and  
15 putative class members' efforts to set up their devices and their accounts on their Bitmain  
16 devices; any other bases for Plaintiff's claims in the Amended Complaint; and issues related to  
17 class certification (including but not limited to, commonality, typicality, and adequacy).

18 In addition, Plaintiff has requested jurisdictional discovery in the event that the Court  
19 determines the facts are insufficient to determine whether it has jurisdiction over Defendant.  
20 Defendant's position is that Plaintiff is not entitled to jurisdictional discovery because he has not  
21 made any showing whatsoever to warrant jurisdictional discovery, including a specific showing  
22 of what facts he hopes to uncover and what reasonable basis he has to believe such facts exist.

23 In the event the Court denies Defendant's pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal  
24 jurisdiction, the Parties will negotiate a stipulated protective order that is based on the Northern  
25 District model for standard litigation. The Parties propose to submit it for approval within 21  
26 days after the Court's ruling on Defendant's pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal  
27 jurisdiction, if this action remains on the Court's docket at that time. The Parties agree to set a  
28

1 deadline for the exchange of merits-based experts once there is a ruling on the MFCC and a trial  
2 date is set, if the action remains active at that time.

### 3 **IX. RELATED CASES**

4 The Parties are not presently aware of any related cases or proceedings pending before  
5 another judge of this Court, or before another court or administrative agency, that center on the  
6 same facts or issues.

### 7 **X. RELIEF**

#### 8 **A. Plaintiff's Position**

9 Plaintiff seeks reimbursement for, inter alia, injunctive relief, restitution and/or  
10 disgorgement. The amount of classwide damages are unknown at this time.

#### 11 **B. Defendant's Position**

12 Defendant does not believe Plaintiff is entitled to any relief sought in the Amended  
13 Complaint, including attorneys' fees and costs.

### 14 **XI. SETTLEMENT AND ADR**

15 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5, the Parties have filed a Stipulation  
16 and [Proposed] Order Selecting ADR Process. (Dkt. No. 40.)

17 The Parties have selected private mediation as the ADR process for this case, to be  
18 completed by no later than one year after the Court's ruling on Defendant's pending motion to  
19 dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, if the case remains active at that time. (*Id.*)

### 20 **XII. CONSENT TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR ALL PURPOSES**

21 The Parties do not consent to have a magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings,  
22 including trial and entry of judgment.

### 23 **XIII. OTHER REFERENCES**

24 Defendant believes this case is subject to binding arbitration and reserves its right to move  
25 to compel arbitration in the event the Court denies its pending motion to dismiss for lack of  
26 personal jurisdiction. Plaintiff will oppose any motion to compel arbitration filed by Defendant.  
27  
28

The Parties agree this case is not suitable for assignment to a special master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”).

#### **XIV. NARROWING OF ISSUES**

At this time, the Parties have not identified any issues that are suitable for narrowing by agreement of the Parties. The Parties note that Plaintiff has already voluntarily dismissed former named defendant Bitmain, Inc. from the action given that entity’s lack of involvement in the facts giving rise to this action. Defendant also notes that its pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction also asks, in the alternative, that the Court dismiss the claims of non-California putative class members under *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior Court of California*, 137 S. Ct. 1773 (2017). (Dkt. No. 33 at 14-15; Dkt. No. 38 at 10.) Additionally, Defendant’s position is that, if the Court denies the pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, Defendant’s anticipated motion to compel arbitration and/or motion for judgment on the pleadings will dispose of the case in its entirety, or, in the alternative, narrow issues that cannot be narrowed by agreement.

Plaintiff’s position is that *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior*, 137 S. Ct. 1773 (2017) is factually inapposite and does not apply to class actions. Accordingly, Defendant’s request to dismiss the claims of non-California putative class members should be denied. Plaintiff also takes the position that there is no basis for Defendant’s anticipated motion for judgment on the pleadings, and that this case is inappropriate for adjudication at the pleadings stage.

#### **XV. EXPEDITED TRIAL PROCEDURE**

The Parties do not believe that this case is suitable for handling under the Expedited Trial Procedure of General Order No. 64 Attachment A.

#### **XVI. SCHEDULING**

##### **A. Plaintiff’s Proposed Schedule**

Plaintiff proposes the following case schedule for the Court’s consideration:

EVENT	DEADLINE/DATE
-------	---------------



Initial Disclosure exchange	January 2, 2020
Defendant's last day to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint	14 days after ruling on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, if the case remains active at that time
Last day to file stipulated proposed protective order	January 9, 2020
Last day to file MFCC	12 months from the order on Defendant's anticipated motion for judgment on the pleadings
Last day to file Opposition	45 days after filing of MFCC
Last day to file Reply	45 days after Opposition is due
Last day for Plaintiff to disclose experts in support of the MFCC	At time Plaintiff's MFCC is filed
Last day for Defendant to disclose experts in opposition to the MFCC	At time Opposition is filed

**B. Defendant's Position on Submitting a Proposed Schedule**

Defendant's position is that it would be premature to agree to a case schedule until the Court rules on its pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. To avoid waiving its personal jurisdiction challenge, *see Peterson*, 140 F.3d at 1317–18, Defendant proposes that the Parties submit a proposed case schedule no later than twenty-one (21) days after the Court's ruling on Defendant's pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, if the action remains active at that time.

**XVII. TRIAL**

Plaintiff has included a jury trial request in his Amended Complaint. The Parties agree that scheduling a trial at this time is premature. The Parties will submit to the Court the appropriate duration of trial, and a date by which they will be prepared to take the case to trial, upon a ruling on Plaintiff's MFCC.

**XVIII. DISCLOSURE OF NON-PARTY INTERESTED IDENTITIES OR PERSONS**

Plaintiff and Defendant have filed their respective Disclosure of Non-Party Interested Certification per Civil Local Rule 3-15.

**XIX. PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT**

All attorneys of record for the Parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Northern District of California and agree to comply with them.

1 **XX. OTHER MATTERS**

2 No other matters were discussed by the Parties that may facilitate the just, speedy and  
3 inexpensive disposition of this matter.  
4

5 DATED: December 12, 2019

**FRONTIER LAW CENTER**

6 By: /s/ Karo G. Karapetyan  
7 Karo G. Karapetyan  
8 Attorney for Plaintiff  
Gor Gevorkyan

9 DATED: December 12, 2019

**O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP**

10  
11 By: /s/ Carlos M. Lazatin  
12 Carlos M. Lazatin  
13 Attorney for Defendant  
14 Bitmain Technologies, Ltd.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**ECF CERTIFICATION**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1, I, Karo G. Karapetyan, hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from all signatories.

DATED: December 12, 2019

FRONTIER LAW CENTER

By: /s/ Karo G. Karapetyan  
Karo G. Karapetyan

CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

The above JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT & PROPOSED ORDER is approved as the Case Management Order for this case and all parties shall comply with its provisions. [In addition, the Court makes the further orders stated below:]

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Hon. James Donato, U.S.D.J.